

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 DANNY ATTERBURY,

12 Petitioner,

2:03-cv-1809-GEB-DAD-P

13 vs.

14 DAVE GRAZINI, et al.,

15 Respondents.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 On April 21, 2005, petitioner filed a request for
18 reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order filed April 15,
19 2005, granting respondents an extension of time to file their
20 response to petitioner's third amended petition. On April 26,
21 2005, petitioner filed a request for reconsideration of the
22 magistrate judge's order filed on April 21, 2005 denying
23 petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel. Pursuant to
24 Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld
25 unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of
26 the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the

1 magistrate judge's rulings were clearly erroneous or contrary to
2 law.

3 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon
4 reconsideration, the orders of the magistrate judge filed on
5 April 15, 2005 and April 21, 2005, are affirmed.

6 Dated: September 16, 2005

7
8 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
9 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
 United States District Judge